

### **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated August 30, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-19 were previously pending in the present Application, with claims 18-19 withdrawn from further consideration. Claims 1-17 remain for consideration upon entry of the present amendments and following remarks. Support for the claim amendments can at least be found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-13 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kim et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0090614) for the reasons stated on pages 2-3 of the Detailed Action.

In response to the arguments presented in the response of July 19, 2006, the Examiner indicates that the amended claim language “wherein the first voltage level is configured to exceed the threshold voltage level of the pull-down part that is increased due to deterioration thereof” is inherently taught in Kim. Specifically, the Examiner further indicates that the second control signal (N4) varies between a first voltage level ( $V_{dd}$ ) and a second control signal (ground) in response to the first control signal (N3), wherein the first voltage level is inherently capable of exceeding the threshold voltage level of the pull down part that is increased due to deterioration thereof.

Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended as set forth above to incorporate the subject matter of allowable claim 14 therein. As such, the §102(e) rejections of claims 1-13 have been overcome, and the Applicants respectfully request that the same be withdrawn.

### **Double Patenting**

Claims 1-17 remain provisionally rejected over claims 1-20 of U.S. Patent 7,038,653, under the judicially created doctrine of non-statutory double patenting, for the reasons stated on pages 3-4 of the Detailed Action.

In response to the arguments presented in the response of April 13, 2006, the Examiner specifically states that claim 1 of the '653 patent recites each stage comprising "a pull up section, a pull down section, pull up driving, first and second pull down driving sections, the second control signal swings between first and second voltage levels and wherein the first voltage level is inherently capable of exceeding the threshold voltage level of the pull down part that is increased due to deterioration thereof." The Examiner also indicates that, contrary to Applicants' previous argument, claim 1 does not recite the deterioration compensation portion.

As indicated above, claim 1 has been amended as set forth above to incorporate the subject matter of allowable claim 14 therein. Claim 14 (now cancelled) specifically recites a deterioration compensation part. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the non-statutory double patenting rejection of claims 1-17 has been overcome, and respectfully request that the same be withdrawn.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 14-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As indicated above, claim 14 has been cancelled and the subject matter thereof incorporated into independent claim 1. Claim 15 is amended to depend directly from claim 1. As such, each of the remaining claims has now been placed in condition for allowance.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /Sean F. Sullivan/  
Sean F. Sullivan  
Reg. No. 38,328  
Confirmation No. 3347  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
PTO Customer No. 23413  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: November 30, 2006